

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/695,311	OOHIRA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David A. Zarneke	2827	

All Participants:

(1) David A. Zarneke.

(2) Robert Mattson.

Status of Application: _____

(3) Yasuyuki Onishi.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 December 2003

Time: 10:00 AM

Type of Interview:

- ☐ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☒ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☒ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

8 and 11

Prior art documents discussed:

Fjelstad & Steffen


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed independent claim 8 and the Steffen rejection. We came to agreement that insertion of a limitation into the claim specifying the device to be adapted to attach to a motherboard would distinguish around Steffen's teaching of a chip card. Regarding claim 11, the examiner believes that the amendment proposed in the interview would require further search and consideration..